



Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/070,455	11/24/93	Hofvander	532622000100

EXAMINER

Fox

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1638 12/29/03

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

1 2

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) James Renenick (3)
(2) David T. Fox (4)

Date of Interview 12/29/03

Type: Telephonic Televideo Conference Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes No If yes, brief description: _____Agreement was reached. was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: All

Identification of prior art discussed: Of record

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner indicated that new matter rejection re "exons, introns" and indefiniteness rejection re "practically complete" would be withdrawn, as Appl rep pointed out bavar in spec. Examiner indicated that written description issue of "deviate therefrom . . ." would

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.
be maintained. Examiner indicated that 102(g) rejection of claims 81-93 would be maintained, unless spec provided clear definition of "fragment" as excluding an essentially full-length gene. Amendment of claim 95 to replace "consisting essentially of" with "comprising" would obviate 112 2nd rejection.